



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

Department of National Security Affairs

American Sociological Section on Peace and War (Newsletter)

1993

Peace and War Newsletter / Spring/Summer 1993

American Sociological Association

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/34330>



Calhoun is a project of the Dudley Knox Library at NPS, furthering the precepts and goals of open government and government transparency. All information contained herein has been approved for release by the NPS Public Affairs Officer.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>

PEACE & WAR

Newsletter - Spring /Summer1993

Section Day - MIAMI - August 17th

Message from the Chair:

Exciting Program Set for Miami

The Peace and War section is sponsoring two exciting panels, a large roundtable session, and is co-sponsoring a half-day tour on "Ethnic Diversity and Community Bridge-Building" at the upcoming ASA meetings in Miami. The first panel, "Building a Peaceful 'New World Order'" will contain a series of proposals for moving the United States toward a more peaceful foreign and military policy, focusing on: just development policies, the peacekeeping and peacemaking roles of the military, economic conversion, social movement strategies, and security and environmental links. The second panel will focus on continuing conflicts and the prospects for their resolution in the areas of the Balkans, South American, and Central America;

with another paper examining the U.N. peacekeeping efforts. We are very fortunate to have two of our distinguished section members as discussants for these sessions: Bill Gamson (incoming ASA president), will discuss the first set of proposals for building a New World Order, and perhaps offer a few suggestions of his own; and Robin Williams (last year's winner of the section's distinguished career award), will discuss the papers on ongoing conflicts and their resolution. In addition, there will be 25 papers presented at 10 roundtables on topics ranging from methods of nonviolent conflict resolution, military organizations, ethics, and the peace movement. There are sure to be many topics of interest for all section members, so be sure to plan on staying for the ENTIRE LAST DAY OF THE MEETINGS, Tuesday, August 17th. A complete listing of the program is included in this newsletter.

(cont'd page 2)

We encourage our members to submit articles on any subject that may be of interest to Section members. Deadline for submission to the next edition of the Newsletter is September, 15, 1993. Send material to Dana Eyre, Department of National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, 93943; (408) 656-2831; or via e-mail to eyre@leland.stanford.edu.

Exciting Program Set For Miami

(cont'd from page 1)

In addition to these wonderful sessions on section day, there are three other activities that I would encourage you to join. On Friday, August 13, the Peace and War section will have a table at the Welcoming and Orientation Party from 6:30-8:00; please stop by to chat, meet new colleagues, or discuss section business. On Sunday, August 15, the section will co-sponsor a reception with the section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements at 6:30 pm. Be sure to check the final program for the room location. On Monday, August 16th, John MacDougall has organized an ethnic tour of Greater Miami with stops in Little Haiti, Liberty City, Little Managua, and Little Havana, ending with lunch at a Cuban restaurant. This should be a great opportunity for tour participants to get a better understanding of the ethnic diversity, conflicts, and bridge-building efforts underway in this area. Check the preregistration materials for more information and to sign up for the tour.

The section business meeting is scheduled to take place on the morning of section day, August 17. The main item of business is planning for the upcoming section workshop on the state of sociological research on war and peace. Please come with your ideas and suggestions for making this a worthwhile workshop for you to attend. The section award for distinguished career contributions in scholarship, teaching or service in the areas of peace and war, and the Boulding student paper award will be announced at the business

meeting as well.

Serving as Chair of the section has been a gratifying experience for me. I have had the opportunity to work with a large number of talented, energetic and committed colleagues to make all of these activities possible. I am very thankful for all of the time and energy they have given to the section. Please show your support for the section by participating in these activities at the meetings. Thanks.

- Sam Marullo

Section Election RESULTS !!!

Mary Anna Colwell has forwarded the results of the 1993 section elections. Those elected are:

Chair-Elect	Kurt Lang
Council	Jen Hlavacek John MacDougall

The by-law changes were approved.

Many thanks to all the nominees from the nominating committee, and many thanks to the members of the nominating committee (Steve Crawford, Jerry Sanders, Mady Segal, Metta Spencer) from Mary Anna Colwell.

RECRUIT one new member!

SECTION ON PEACE AND WAR SESSIONS & ROUNDTABLES

(All session numbers and times are from the preliminary program.)

Building a Peaceful "New World Order"

(#333 10:30-12:30, Tuesday, August 17)

Organizer and Presider: Sam Marullo, Georgetown University

"Building a Post-Nuclear World Order: Linking Nuclear Disarmament and Military Conversion on a Global Scale"

Greg McLauchlan, University of Oregon

"Peacekeeping & Peacemaking in the Post-Cold War World: The Role of World Militaries"

Dana P. Eyre, Naval Postgraduate School

"Structural Constraints, Political Choices: Economic Conversion After the Cold War"

Elizabeth A. Sherman, University of Massachusetts

"Political Opportunity After the Cold War: The Paradox of Open Windows"

David S. Meyer, Tufts University

"Shared Fate? The Relationship Between National Interest and Global Security in the Post-Cold War World"

Paul Joseph, Tufts University

Discussant: William Gamson, Boston College

Conflicts and Their Resolutions

(#346 12:30-2:30, Tuesday, August 17)

Organizer: Sam Marullo, Georgetown University
Presider: Ruth Searles, University of Toledo

"1993 in the Balkans"

Stjepan G. Mestrovic, Texas A&M University and Slaven Letica, University of Zagreb

"Transition to Democracy: Coalition Negotiations in Chile"

Denise Williams, University of California--Santa Barbara

"Why Insurgencies Persist"

Jeff Goodwin, New York University

"Perspectives on Peacekeeping in the 1990s"

David R. Segal, University of Maryland

Discussant: Robin Williams, Cornell University

Refereed Roundtables

(#320 8:30-9:30, Tuesday, August 17)

Organizer: Sam Marullo, Georgetown University

1. Student Research on Peace and War I

Organizer and Presider: Jackie Smith, University of Notre Dame

Presentation by Elise Boulding Student Award winner

"Global Patterns of Integration Among States: Linkages in the World Order and Political Violence"

Shawn McEntee, The Ohio State University

"Conflict Within Social Networks and the Strategic Control of Third-Party Support"

Jay E. Cross, Columbia University

2. Student Research on Peace and War II

Organizer: Jackie Smith, University of Notre Dame

"The Origins of the American Military Bases in the Philippines"

Isagani O. Sta-Maria, Northeastern Illinois University

"Green Politics: The Movement/Party Nexus"

Mike Haffey, University of Colorado

3. Conceptually Expanding Nonviolent Conflict Resolution

"How to Advance the Sociology of Peace -- and Peace"

Robert A. Irwin, Brandeis University

"The Geography of Nonviolence"

Dr. Lester R. Kurtz and Sarah Beth Asher, University of Texas--Austin

Refereed Roundtables (cont'd)

"Evaluating Mediation Training in Elementary School"

Matthew Johnson, Siena College

4. The U.S. Peace Movement

"Organizational Demise in a Declining Movement: The Death of Peace Groups in the Late 1980s"

Bob Edwards and John Crist, Catholic University and Sam Marullo, Georgetown University

"Oligarchy in American Peace Groups"

John Lofland, University of California--Davis and Joseph J. Fahey, Manhattan College

5. Ethics in Making War and Making Peace

"Ethical Components in Conflict Resolution"

Joseph Gittler, Duke University

"Physicists, Ethics and Star Wars: The Role of Scientific Knowledge"

Michael Nusbaumer, Judith DiIorio, and Robert Baller, Indiana University, Purdue University

"Social Activism and Moral Development"

Julie Hart, Notre Dame

6. Conflict Escalation and De-escalation

"Proliferation and Militarization in the 'New World Order'"

Mark Lupher, University of Virginia

"The Management of Capabilities in Developing Conflicts"

Edward Bassin, Washington State University

"Nuclear Amnesia: Forgetting the Arms Race After the Cold War"

Jennifer Turpin, University of San Francisco

7. Building Peace in Latin America

"Liberating Nonviolence: The Role of Servicio Paz y Justicia in the Argentine and Uruguayan Transitions to Democracy"

Ron Pagnucco and Fran Teplitz, Kroc Institute, Notre Dame

"Demilitarization in Central America"

Christopher Dale, New England College

8. The Military as an Institution

"Sexual Harassment in the Military: Individualized and Environmental Contexts"

Juanita M. Firestone and Richard J. Harris, University of Texas--San Antonio

"The Institutional/Occupational Thesis of the Military Profession: Insights from Medical Sociology and Sociology of Science"

David Rier, Columbia University

"Forward Deployed Soldiers, Significant Others and Telecommunications: Cold War and Post-Cold War Perspectives"

Morten G. Ender, University of Maryland

9. Wars in the Middle East

"The Gulf War, Sanctions, and the Lives of Iraqi Women"

Louise Cainkar, Human Rights Research Foundation

"The Israeli Debate about Arab National Identity"

Gil Eyal, U.C.L.A.

10. Feminist Perspectives on Peace and War

"Feminist Perspectives on Peace and War"

Dr. Hoda Mahmoudi, California Lutheran University

"Understanding the Concept Peace: A Search for Common Ground"

Milton Rinehart, University of Colorado

Surge & Decline in Section Membership

by David R. Segal

The decline in Section membership reported in the Winter 1993 Newsletter is disheartening, but not surprising. It reflects a reversion to an earlier state of affairs, with interesting self-destructive nuances. I must accept partial responsibility for the decline. It also reflects a problem that can be solved, if addressed in time.

From the establishment of the Section in 1978 through the first decade of its organization life, membership teetered perilously on the brink of the 200 person minimum required by ASA for survival. During this period, the membership was composed largely of sociologists who studied the peace movement, and those who wanted to take a symbolic stance in favor of peace. Although a small number of prominent military sociologists such as Morris Janowitz, Charles Moskos, and Kurt Lang were active in the Section (all served on Council in the early years and Kurt served as chair) most sociologists who studied war as a social process or the military institutions that waged war (myself included), who constitute one of the natural constituencies of the Section, were not made to feel welcome.

In 1990, John Lofland, then Chair of the Section, recognizing the common objectives of sociologists who study peace and those who study war and the military, sought to make the section more hospitable to the latter group. He asked his membership committee to recruit in this community, and he asked

his election committee to assure its representation among the Section's officers both by including sociologists from this group among the nominees for Section office, and by not forcing choices between "peace candidates" and "war candidates." Similar steps had been taken earlier by the Section on Organizations and Occupations to accommodate major diverse constituencies.

Among the consequences of John's actions were growth in Section membership, to the point of having the first comfortable cushion in our history, and my becoming chair-elect. Other sociologists who study war and the military became active in the committee work of the Section, and participated in Section programs at the ASA annual meetings.

Lou Kriesberg continued the precedent established by John, and the Section continued to grow, achieving record membership. However, the system broke down on my watch. There was a procedural disagreement among the members of the election committee that I appointed. I was informed about it, but did not intervene. The three nominees selected from among sociologists who study war and the military essentially ran against those from the "peace" tradition. None was elected. There were other indicators of a reemerging rift in our Section as well. I heard rumblings of my election being interpreted by portions of our membership as a takeover by military sociology, and a session on the Gulf War at the 1992 Annual Meetings was briefly disrupted.

When Jim Skelly, who chaired the elections committee, reported the results

to me, I confided in him that I expected a decline in membership as a result. I fear that the data confirm my hypothesis. Undoubtedly, we will recoup to some degree, but we have clearly lost ground.

Ironically, the turnabout comes at a time when the number of people studying war and the military is growing and the field is becoming more mainstream (although this is only a matter of degree) as our discipline learns that mobilizations for war have persisting consequences for social structure and the life course of those who serve, and as issues of gender roles, work and family interface, and sexual preference come to the fore in the research agenda of military sociology. My sense is that at the same time, the number of sociologists who primarily study peace is declining.

There are not enough sociologists who study war and the military to constitute an ASA section. Neither are there enough sociologists who study peace to do so. That in itself reflects poorly on our discipline. Our section has again slipped well below the minimum required size. Individual members of each group can find an intellectual home in other Sections of the ASA. For us to fragment in this way would be a denial of the importance of contemporary events in Bosnia, Somalia, Cambodia, and elsewhere. It would reaffirm perceptions of Sociology as a discipline out of touch with the important processes and problems of our time.

Simply asking our current members to recruit new members may fix the problem temporarily, but it will not save us in the long term. Our current members are not renewing their own

memberships. Our Chair, Chair-Elect, and Council are going to have to find a way to attract and to hold a membership that increasingly is being actively recruited by other sections. Explicit recognition of the diversity of our constituency, and guaranteed representation of that diversity among our elected officers would be a good place to start.

Emotions Section Invites Participation in Los Angeles:

The Sociology of Emotions section invites members of the Peace and War section to participate in a major roundtable session with the theme, "Infusing Social Institutions with Emotions," at the 1994 ASA meetings.

The topic stems from James Coleman's 1992 presidential address (see text in ASR, February 1993) in which he proposed that new, rationally-constructed social institutions, are needed to replace older, non-functioning social forms, and that sociologists should address how the new institutions can be built.

In keeping with his theoretical bent, Coleman stressed the rational incentives that would make the new institutions effective. But the Emotions Section challenged Coleman on the ground that social institutions don't succeed on the basis of rational incentives alone. They must also induce suitable emotions -- commitment, trust, liking, hope, respect and the like-- in their participants. Coleman agreed and urged members of the Emotions Section to provide understandings of how the important emotional microfoundations of macro institutions can be created.

The Emotions Section invites all sociologists with interests in institutional structure and performance to contribute to this topic from the unique perspective of their institutional interests. Papers, ideas for discussion topics, etc., should be submitted to Victor Gecas, Department of Sociology, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164. DEADLINE: December 31, 1993.

Congressional Testimony:

David R. Segal Before the Armed Services Committee, United States House of Representatives and United States Senate.

(Excerpts selected by Dana Eyre)

I have been asked to speak to you about four issues: lifting the ban on homosexuals serving in the American armed forces; what strategy should be followed if the ban is lifted; what the experience of foreign military forces with integration on the basis of sexual orientation has been; and what the relevance of the foreign experience is to the debate on the appropriate policy for the United States of America.....

To get my position clearly on the record for purposes of our discussion today, I find that there has been a general trend toward increasing tolerance for homosexuals in the democratic nations of the Western world. Policies regarding integration of homosexuals in the military have followed these changes, albeit at a slower rate. Practices involving homosexuals in the military have differed from official policy, sometimes reflecting greater tolerance and sometimes less. The number of nations that officially excludes homosexuals from the military is diminishing. While these nations have different force structures and missions than the U.S. armed forces, they serve as important indicators of the direction of global social change.

The United States of America prior to January of this year, in terms of the consistency of its policies and practices regarding the accession and continued service of homosexuals in the military, was the least tolerant of the nations that I have studied. I would recommend lifting the ban as an acknowledgment of ongoing social changes that I believe are inevitable, as an acknowledgment that there are no data that indicate that military effectiveness would be undermined if the ban were lifted, and as an acknowledgment that the cross-national experience suggests that lifting the ban is likely to have very little impact on our armed forces. The major impact will be to free homosexuals who, as we know, already serve in our armed forces, from the burdens of having to lie about

their sexual orientations and wonder who is looking over their shoulders. While there are demands of varying levels of intensity in several countries for the right of homosexuals to serve, relatively few homosexuals actually seem to serve, and fewer still make public statements about their sexuality.

Lifting the ban would enable us to more effectively manage the process of sexual orientation integration, using lessons learned from the experiences of other nations, as much because of their differences from us as because of their similarities, and from our own experience in racial and gender integration. These lessons include the importance of moving incrementally, which is the way the policy process in this nation unfolds, rather than trying to achieve dramatic social change of an instant. They include the importance of establishing standards of conduct that specify for military personnel the kinds of behavior that will not be tolerated, both in terms of bringing their sexuality into the work place and in terms of recognition of the rights of minorities. They include insistence on the responsibility of leaders to assure that these standards are adhered to. And they include importance of establishing educational programs to be conducted throughout the military career to sensitize armed forces personnel to the subtleties of one of the major leadership challenges of the twenty-first century: the management of diversity.....

With regard to the American armed forces the citizenship revolution can be seen in racial integration, in the ongoing process of gender integration, and in the lowering of the age of political majority from 21 to 18 during the Vietnam War to acknowledge the full citizenship of young men who could be drafted and asked to give their lives for their country. People for whom I have the greatest respect, including General Colin Powell have taken issue with the parallels that have been suggested between racial discrimination and sexual orientation discrimination. You will note in my written testimony that analysts from several nations other than the United States have commented on similarities between racial or ethnic integration, gender integration, and integration on the basis of sexual orientation. Let me be very clear that I in no way argue or assume that the historical experiences of African-Americans, women, and

homosexuals have been the same. Each of these groups brings distinct dimensions and experiences to the citizenship revolution. their major commonality is in the reactions of the dominant groups in society to all of them, and the reasons that have been given in the past for the exclusion of each of them from full military participation.

Equal treatment of previously excluded groups is not the sole criterion in this social change. Another is the impact of change on national security. One specific component of national security concerns has been the impact of change on unit cohesion. Another is the ability of excluded groups to adapt to elements of the military life-style that are essential to performance and national security. With regard to every group considered, in every nation with which I am familiar, standards of inclusion or exclusion have been held up to an effectiveness criterion. When we dealt with issues of racial integration and gender integration in our armed forces, a major concern was what impact such integration would have on performance. And we moved incrementally on both of these fronts.....

The issue of cohesion Assertions were made in the 1940s that the presence of African-American soldiers in previously all white units would undermine unit cohesion and thereby effectiveness. More recently, arguments have been made that the integration of female soldiers in previously all-male units would undermine cohesion and thereby effectiveness: cohesion came to be defined as male bonding. However, the impact of racial integration and gender integration on cohesion has been minimal, and any impact on effectiveness has been so small as to be unmeasurable. There are currently assertions that sexual orientation integration will similarly undermine cohesion. It is now defined as heterosexual male bonding.

Much of the contemporary discussion of military cohesion is rooted in research conducted by Samuel Stouffer and his associates on American soldiers, and by Edward Shils and Morris Janowitz, who were responsible for the interpretation of data from the interrogation of German Prisoners of War in the European Theater. However, the World War II research on cohesion in both the German and American armies tends to be selectively remembered and misinterpreted, both in the policy and in the research

communities. Stouffer did not find that cohesion was the major thing that kept soldiers going in combat: prayer or religion was, although cohesion was an important factor. And Shils and Janowitz did not find that social similarity was the major thing that German soldiers captured in France reported as their primary combat motivator. Fear of what would happen to their families in Germany if they deserted or surrendered was. Primary group cohesion was important, but Shils and Janowitz did not demonstrate that primary group cohesion was undermined by homosexual tendencies..... I introduce this...to point out that the one piece of research of which I am aware that addresses the issue -- a piece of research that is widely cited in the military cohesion literature-- throws into question the assertion that (the presence of homosexuals) will necessarily undermine unit cohesion.....

(cont'd next newsletter)

Upcoming Meetings

Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society biennial conference will be held October 22-24, 1993 in Baltimore, MD. The meetings will include panels on a wide variety of issues including civil military relations in the post-Cold War world, sexual orientation and military service, and peacekeeping. Contact the IUS Secretariat at The University of Chicago, 1126 East 59th Street, Box 46, Chicago, IL 60637, for membership and conference information.

The Social Science History Association will also be meeting in Baltimore, 4-7 November, 1993.

Grants and Fellowships

The Social Science Research Council has announced deadlines for its various funding opportunities. Applications for the SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Fellowships on Peace and Security in a Changing World are due 1 December, 1993, while applications for the Research Workshop Competition and Visiting Scholar Grants are due 15 September, 1993. For information contact Paul Erickson at SSRC, 605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158. (212) 661-0280